S5 Table. Risk of bias assessment

Fe at the	I	t	Tora	luc a martin	Tors.	T	T	Ton	I	Torr.	Was IV				L	I.e	T		T	T	Lau			L	Les	Torr.	Ton	I	T	Inc. co.
Author, Year	Study Design	Were the DM+ and	Were the DM	Was the DM Were measured in confound	Were	Were the	Were the TE measured in		Was follow	strategies to			TB- matched	Were the same criteria used for	Was DM measured in a	Was DM measured in the	Were confounding	Were strategies to deal with	Were TB assessed in a	Was the DM	Was appropriate statistical analysis	Were the criteria		Was the DM measured in a	Were objective, standard criteria		Were strategies to deal with		appropriate	Risk of blais
		DM+ and DM- groups		a valid and factors	deal with		a valid and		and if not,	address to				identification of		same way for	factors identified?		standard, valid	long enough to be		the sample		valid and reliable		factors		valid and reliab	appropriate	
		similar and	similarly to	reliable way? identified		ing the TB at the			t ware the	incomplete		ther than			and reliable way?			factors stated?	and reliable way	meaningful?	useu:			way?	measurement of		factors stated?		analysis used?	,
		recruited	assign	remove may : routined	factors	start of the	consiste may	sufficient to	reasons to	follow up		resence of TB		10+81010-1	and remains may	TOT BIG TOT		rectora atendo	for TB+ and TB-7	meaning an		Cleany General	detail?	may.	the condition?	rountineo:	INCOORS SHAREST		mmy ara dated i	'
		from the	people to		stated?	study (or at			loss to	utilized?		n cases or							IOI TO+ MIG TO-				German 1		une conditions					
		same	both DM+			the momen		enough for				bsence of TB																		
		population?	and DM-			of DM)?		TB to occur	2 described			n controls?																		
		,-,-	groups?						and		1																			
									explored?																					
Alisjahbana, 2006	Case control										,	res	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes								1	Low risk of bias
Boillat-blanco, 2016	Case control										,	res	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes								1	Low risk of bias
Brassard, 2006	Case control											(es		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes									Low risk of bias
Buskin, 1994	Case control											éo		Yes	Unclear	Unclear		Yes	No	Unclear	Yes									High risk of bias
Chung, 2014	Case control										- 1	es.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes									Low risk of bias
Corris, 2012	Case control											10	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Yes									Moderate risk of bia
Davis, 2017	Case control										- 1	res .		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Yes									Low risk of bias
Faurholt-Jepsen, 2011	Case control				_							(es	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Yes									Low risk of bias
Haraldsdottir. 2015	Case control	1	-				-	1	-	1		ło.	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes						+	1		Moderate risk of bia
Hossain. 2014	Case control	1	-				-	1	-	1	- 1	éo.		No	Yes	Yes		No	Yes	Yes	No						+	1		High risk of bias
Jick. 2006	Case control	1	-			_		-	-			res .		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes			-	-		+	1	+	Low risk of bias
Jurcey-Savicevic, 2013	Case control	1	-			_		-	-		- 1	(es		Yes	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes			-	-		+	1	+	Low risk of bias
Lai. 2014	Case control	1	-			_		-	-			res .			Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes			-	-		+	1	+	Low risk of bias
Lee, 2013	Case control Case control	 	-				+	-	-	-		60		Yes Yes	Yes	Yes Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes Yes	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	Low risk of bias Low risk of bias
Leegaard, 2011 Mori. 1992	Case control	 	-				+	-	-	-		res In		Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Unclear	Yes	Yes	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	
			-				_	-	-			60		Yes No	Yes	Yes No	Yes	Yes	Unclear								+		+	Moderate risk of bia High risk of bias
Ndishimve, 2017 Pablos-Méndez, 1997	Case control Case control		-		_	_		-	-	_		res		Yes	No	Yes	No No	NO.	Yes	Unclear Unclear	Yes						+		+	High risk of bias
Pereira. 2016	Case control		-		_	_		-	-	_	- (ros		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Unclear	Yes						+		+	Low risk of bias
	Case control		-				_	-	-		- 1	res		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	Unclear	Yes						+		+	High risk of bias
Pérez, 2006 Shimouchi, 2020	Case control		-		_	_		-	-	_		eo res		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Yes						+		+	Low risk of bias
Viney, 2015	Case control		-		_	_		-	-	_		les le		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	145	Yor	Unclear	Yes						+		+	Moderate risk of bia
Zhissinov 2016	Case control		_		_	_		+	+			40		No	No	Ne	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Yes						+		+	Moderate risk of bia
Golub, 2019	Cohort	Yes	Yes	Yes Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Not	Yes	65	190	NO	reu	NO	195	165	195	OTCHAR	165						+		+	Low risk of bias
GGILD, 2013	CONDIT		. 63	163	103	163	163	163	163	annicable	143																			LOW HAN OF DIES
Kim. 1995	Cohort	Unclear	Yes	Yes No	Not	Unclear	Voc	Yes	Undear	Unclear	Yes																+		+	Moderate risk of bia
Nin, 1333	CONDIT	OHOME	. 63	140	annlicable	o Cincinna	163	163	Oriotta	Orioess	143																			MODELINE HAR OF DRIE
Kup. 2013	Cohort	Yes	Yes	Yes Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes																+		+	Low risk of bias
Lee. 2014	Cohort	Yes	Yes	Yes Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Not	Yes																1		1	Low risk of bias
										applicable																				
Lee. 2016	Cohort	Yes	Yes	Yes Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Undear	Undear	Yes																+		+	Low risk of bias
Leung, 2008	Cohort	Yes	Yes	Yes Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes																1		1	Low risk of bias
										applicable																				
Lin, 2017	Cohort	Yes	Yes	Yes Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Not	Yes																		1	Low risk of bias
										applicable																				
Lin. 2019	Cohort	No	Yes	Yes Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Undear	No	Yes																			Moderate risk of bia
Pealing, 2015	Cohort	Yes	Yes	Yes Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes					1	1		1		1						1	1	1	Low risk of bias
-	1	1	1				1	<u> </u>	1	applicable			1		1	1				l	1			1	1	1		1		
Shen, 2014	Cohort	Yes	Yes	Yes No	Not	Yes	Yes	Yes	Undear	Undear	Yes								1	1			_					1	1	Moderate risk of bia
	1.	1	-		applicable	0	-	1	-							1				-	1						+	1		
Baker. 2012	Cross sectional	1														1					1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Low risk of bias
Barron, 2018 - Diabetes	Cross sectional	1	-				-	1	-	1						1				-	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Low risk of bias
Barron, 2018 - Prediabetes	Cross sectional	1	-				-	1	-	1						1				-	1	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Low risk of bias
Chen. 2006	Cross sectional	1	-				-	1	-	1						1				-	1	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Moderate risk of bia
Faurholt-Jepsen, 2014	Cross sectional	1	-			_		-	-				-			1					1	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Moderate risk of bia
Hensel, 2016	Cross sectional	1	-			_		-	-				-			1					1	Yes	Tes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Low risk of bias
Khawcharoenporn. 2015	Cross sectional	1	-			_		-	-				-			1					1	Yes	TOS	Unclear	Yes	Yes		Yes		Low risk of bias
Kubiak 2019	Cross sectional Cross sectional	1	-				+	-	-	-			-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	+	Yes	Tes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Low risk of bias Low risk of bias
Shu, 2012		1	-				+	-	-	_			-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	+	Yes	162	Unclear		Yes	Yes Yes	Yes	Yes	
	Cross sectional	1	-				+	-	-	-			-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	+	Yes	TOS	Yes		Yes	TOS	Yes	Yes	Low risk of bias
Suwanpimolkul. 2014 - Active TB						_	+	+	1	1			-		-	+	-	-	+	-	+	Yes	Tes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes Yes	Low risk of bias Low risk of bias
Suwanpimolkul. 2014 - LTBI	Cross sectional																													
Swannimolkul. 2014 - LTBI Swama Nantha. 2017	Cross sectional		-		_				_	_												Vee	Ves	Unaless	Ves		Yes .			
Suwanoimolkul. 2014 - LTBI Swama Nantha. 2017 Ting. 2014	Cross sectional Cross sectional																					Yes	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Low risk of bias
Suwanoimoleut 2014 - LTBI Swama Nariha, 2017 Tino, 2014 Wano, 2013	Cross sectional Cross sectional Cross sectional																					Yes Yes	Yes Yes	Unclear Yes	Yes Yes	Yes Yes	Yes Yes		Yes Yes	Low risk of bias Low risk of bias
Suwanpimolkul. 2014 - LTBI Swama Nantha. 2017 Ting. 2014	Cross sectional Cross sectional																					Yes Yes Yes	Yes Yes Yes	Unclear Yes No	Yes Yes	Yes	Yes Yes No	Yes	Yes	Low risk of bias